

Galaxies in filaments have more satellites: the influence of the cosmic web on the satellite luminosity function in the SDSS

Quan Guo

Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam, An der Sternwarte 16, D-14482 Potsdam, Germany
qguo@aip.de

E. Tempel

Tartu Observatory, Observatooriumi 1, 61602 Tõravere, Estonia
National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Rävala pst 10, Tallinn 10143, Estonia

N. I. Libeskind

Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam, An der Sternwarte 16, D-14482 Potsdam, Germany

ABSTRACT

We investigate if the satellite luminosity function (LFs) of primary galaxies identified in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS DR8) depends on whether the host galaxy is in a filament or not. Isolated primary galaxies are identified in the SDSS spectroscopic sample while potential satellites are searched for in the much deeper photometric sample. Filaments are constructed from the galaxy distribution by the “Bisous” process. Isolated primary galaxies are divided into two subsamples: those in filaments and those not in filaments. We examine the stacked mean LF of each sample and found that, in the mean, the satellite LFs of primary galaxies (extending to at least 4 magnitude fainter than the primary galaxies) in filaments is significantly higher than those of primary galaxies not in filaments. The filamentary environment can increase the abundance of the brightest satellites ($M_{\text{sat.}} < M_{\text{prim.}} + 2.0$), by a factor of ~ 2 compared with non-filament galaxies. This result is independent of primary galaxy magnitude although the satellite LF of galaxies in the faintest magnitude bin, is too noisy to determine if such a dependence exists. Since our filaments are extracted from a flux-limited sample, we consider the possibility that the difference in satellite LF is due to a redshift, colour or environmental bias, finding these to be insufficient to explain our result. The dependence of the satellite LF on the cosmic web suggests that the filamentary environment may have a strong effect on the efficiency of galaxy formation.

Subject headings: large-scale structure of universe — galaxies: luminosity function, mass function — galaxies: abundances

1. Introduction

The Λ CDM model predicts that structure forms in a hierarchical manner. The first objects to collapse and virialize at high redshift are small dark matter haloes that later merge to form larger objects. Small haloes that host satellite or dwarf galaxies, can often survive the violent process associated with halo mergers for many Giga-years

providing important information about galaxy formation, the population of subhaloes, and even the nature of dark matter.

Moreover these dark matter structures form an intricate pattern on the megaparsec scale, known as “cosmic web” (Bond et al. 1996), consisting of regions termed voids, filaments, sheets and knots. The cosmic web is a direct consequence of the

gravitational instabilities that emerge out of the primordial density field. The presence of such cosmic pattern has been confirmed observationally by the distribution of the galaxies from the large surveys such as the 2dF Galaxy Redshift Survey (2dFGRS; Colless et al. 2001, 2003), the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; York et al. 2000; Tegmark et al. 2004), the Two Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS; Huchra et al. 2005) and Galaxy And Mass Assembly (GAMA; Alpaslan et al. 2014).

The effect of the cosmic web on halo properties such as abundance, shape, spin and assembly bias has been investigated (Aragón-Calvo et al. 2007; Hahn et al. 2007a; Libeskind et al. 2012; Hahn et al. 2007b; Cautun et al. 2013; Libeskind et al. 2013a). Moreover, the orientation between the direction of halo spin or shape with the principle axis of filaments (the spine) and walls (the normal) (Altay et al. 2006; Aragón-Calvo et al. 2007; Hahn et al. 2007a,b; Zhang et al. 2009; Libeskind et al. 2013b; Aragon-Calvo 2013; Dubois et al. 2014) has also been studied and corrections have been found. Although more difficult to quantify owing to degeneracies and inherent biases, similar studies have been applied to observational samples (Jones et al. 2010; Tempel et al. 2013; Tempel & Libeskind 2013; Zhang et al. 2013).

Tying galaxy or halo properties to the environment is not a new idea and many studies have quantified the importance of such relations for galaxy formation and evolution (e.g. Dressler 1980; Kauffmann et al. 2004; Blanton et al. 2005; Tempel et al. 2011). On the larger scales of the cosmic web, the properties of galaxies depends on the cosmic filament it inhabits (e.g. Murphy et al. 2011; Jones et al. 2010) or on the supercluster environment (e.g. Lietzen et al. 2012; Einasto et al. 2014). However, to date no observational studies have examined the effect of the cosmic web environment on subhaloes.

Analyzing satellite systems of external galaxies is challenging, because typically only several satellites are detected per primary galaxy. Furthermore the real space position of a satellite with respect to its primary is uncertain. Again, owing to the advent of large galaxy surveys, a statistically robust estimate of the satellite luminosity function (LF) has become possible (e.g. Guo et al. 2011; Tal & van Dokkum 2011; Wang & White 2012).

In this study, we investigate if the satellite LF depends on whether the primary is located within a filament. For this, we use the isolated primary galaxy sample selected by Guo et al. (2011, 2012) from the SDSS DR8 spectroscopic sample, which excludes primary galaxies in clusters or groups. We then divide these isolated primary galaxies into two categories: those within filaments defined by the “Bisous process” as in Tempel et al. (2014) and those not in these filaments. Each subsample is then divided into three bins according to the primary’s magnitude. The resulting subsamples enable us to study the satellite LFs of isolated primary galaxies in filaments and compare them with isolated primary galaxies not in filaments. Such an analysis will help us understand how the filament environment affects galaxy formation within it.

Throughout the paper we assume a fiducial Λ CDM cosmological model with $\Omega_M = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ and $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.

2. Data and Methods

2.1. SDSS isolated galaxies

Galaxies from both the spectroscopic and photometric samples in the SDSS DR8 (Aihara et al. 2011) are used for this study. Isolated primary galaxies, as defined in Guo et al. (2011, 2012), are selected from the spectroscopic survey; satellites can come from either the spectroscopic or photometric surveys. With the relatively poorly constrained distance provided by the photometric redshifts, a statistical background subtraction is performed to obtain an estimate of the satellite galaxy population around each primary, as described in section 3 of Guo et al. (2011). We use de-reddened *ugriz* bands model magnitudes and *k*-correct all galaxies to $z = 0$ with the IDL code of Blanton & Roweis (2007).

We divide selected isolated primary galaxies into three magnitude bins centred on the *r* band absolute magnitude, $^{0.0}M_c^r = -21.0, -22.0, -23.0$. The same values of $(R_{\text{inner}}, R_{\text{outer}}) = (0.3, 0.6), (0.4, 0.8)$ and $(0.55, 0.9)$ Mpc for primaries in magnitude bins, $^{0.0}M_c^r = -21.0, -22.0$ and -23.0 respectively, as those in Guo et al. (2012) are used. R_{inner} represents the projected radius within which satellites may reside, and the variable R_{outer} defines the outer edge of an annulus within which the local background is esti-

mated. The values of other selection parameters, $\{\Delta M_{\text{bin}}, \Delta M_{\text{faint}}, \Delta z_s, \alpha_p, m_v^{\text{lim}}\} = \{0.5, 0.5, 0.002, 2.5, 20.5\}$, are the same as the default values described in Guo et al. (2012). Here ΔM_{bin} is the width of the primary magnitude $^{0.0}M_c^r$ bin, while ΔM_{faint} is the magnitude difference between the primary and the brightest satellites used to identify “isolated” primaries. Δz_s and α_p are parameters used to exclude galaxies that are at a significantly different spectroscopic redshift and photometric redshift respectively (see section 2 of Guo et al. (2011) for the details). m_v^{lim} is an extra magnitude cut to ensure higher completeness of faint galaxies in the photometric samples.

2.2. SDSS galaxy filaments

The catalogue of filaments are built by applying an object point process with interactions (the Bisous process) to the distribution of galaxies in the spectroscopic galaxy sample from SDSS DR8 as described in Tempel et al. (2014). In this method, random small segments (cylinders) based on the positions of galaxies are used to form the filamentary networks according to connection and alignment between these segments. A deterministic filamentary pattern spine can be extracted based on the detection probability and filament orientation (see Tempel et al. 2014).

The catalogue of filaments (the filament spines) we used in this study is the same as compiled in Tempel et al. (2014), where the assumed filament radius is roughly 0.71 Mpc. The filaments of such scale should have strong impact on the galaxy evolution. We classify a galaxy as “in filaments” if the distance of the galaxy from the axis of filament is less than 0.71 Mpc and the distance of the galaxy from the end point of filament (if the galaxy is outside a filamentary cylinder) is less than 0.14 Mpc.

2.3. Estimating the satellite luminosity functions and projected number density profiles

The isolated primaries are selected from the spectroscopic sample in SDSS DR8. They have magnitude, M_p , satisfying $^{0.0}M_c^r - \Delta M_{\text{bin}} < M_p < ^{0.0}M_c^r + \Delta M_{\text{bin}}$ and are isolated in the sense that no other galaxy within $\Delta M_{\text{faint}} = 0.5$ magnitudes lies within a projected distance of $2R_{\text{inner}}$ and is sufficiently close in redshift. Only sufficiently close




Fig. 1.— The distributions of redshift for primary galaxies in three magnitude bins, $^{0.0}M_c^r = -21.0, -22.0, -23.0$ are shown in black, blue and red respectively. The redshift distributions of the primary galaxies in filaments are shown in solid lines. Those of the primary galaxies not in filaments are shown in dashed lines.

galaxies in redshift are included when counting the potential satellites within the projected radius R_{inner} and making the local background estimate from the surrounding annulus out to R_{outer} . The background-subtracted satellite systems are stacked for primaries in each absolute magnitude bin to provide estimates for the mean satellite LF as well as the scaled mean projected number density profiles of satellites more luminous than a particular absolute magnitude (as described more fully in Guo et al. 2011, 2012). The latter is the mean projected number density profile, recast in terms of $x = r/r_{200}$ and divided by the total number of satellites within r_{200} . The values of r_{200} are the same as in Guo et al. (2012, 2013).

3. Results

By cross-matching our isolated primary galaxy sample with the filament catalogue, all matched galaxies can be divided into two categories: galaxies in filaments and those not in filaments. In the three magnitude bins, $^{0.0}M_c^r = -21.0, -22.0, -23.0$, there are 3415, 2646, 661 galaxies (out of 22797, 34385, 12243 respectively) in filaments. Thus for each magnitude bin we are examining the percentage if galaxies in filaments is roughly 13.7%, 7.6% and 5.4%. Figure 1 shows the distri-

butions of redshifts for the matched isolated primary galaxies in filaments and not in filaments. The redshift of the primary galaxies in filaments tends to be lower than those within the same magnitude bin but not in filaments. Such a redshift bias is due to the fact that filaments are identified in the flux-limited galaxy sample: galaxies at low redshifts are thus more likely to be found in filaments.




Fig. 2.— The estimated satellite LFs (top panel) for all primary galaxies, ones in filaments and ones not in filaments are shown in points, solid lines and dashed lines, respectively. The results for different magnitude bins $^{0.0}M_c^r = -21.0, -22.0, -23.0$ are shown in black, blue and red lines, respectively. The ratio of the satellite LFs of the primary galaxies in filaments to those of the primary galaxies in the same magnitude bin but not in filaments (only for $^{0.0}M_c^r = -22.0, -23.0$) in bottom panel.

The comparison of the satellite LF of galaxies within and outside of filaments is shown in top panel of Figure 2. For the magnitude bin $^{0.0}M_c^r = -21.0$, the results are too noisy to show any difference (if one existed): the mean number of satellites around these low luminosity primary galaxies is intrinsically lower than that of bright primary galaxies and the number of these low-luminosity primary galaxies found in filaments is not sufficiently high to have good signal-to-noise

ratio.

Beyond the faintest magnitude bin, the satellites LFs of primary galaxies in filaments (extending to at least 4 magnitude fainter than the primary galaxies) are significantly higher than those of primary galaxies that are in the same magnitude bins but not in filaments. In the bright end of satellite LFs, the amplitude of satellite LFs of the primary galaxies in filaments could be almost twice higher than those of the primary galaxies that are in the same magnitude bins but not in the filaments. This is our main result: *at a given magnitude, isolated galaxies in filaments have more bright satellites than isolated galaxies that are not in filaments.*

As we have shown in Figure 1, there is a strong redshift-distribution bias in the sample of isolated primary galaxies in filament compared with the sample of ones in the same magnitude bins but not in filaments. To test whether the difference of the satellite LFs we have seen is caused by such redshift bias between the primary galaxy samples we perform the following test. Consider the satellite LF not in filaments. The contribution to the total “not in filament” satellite LF from a given primary is weighted according to what fraction of all galaxies, at that z , are found in filaments and what fraction are not. For example, at $0.07 < z < 0.08$ most galaxies (68%) are not in filaments. Thus when we compute the contribution for a primary that is found not in filaments and in this redshift range, we weight its satellite luminosity function by 0.47 ($=32/68$). In this way regions dominated by filaments and regions devoid of filaments are given inverse weights. If the result we have found is not driven by a redshift dependent satellite LF, such a test should give identical satellite LFs. The satellite LF with weighting is thus estimated as:

$$\overline{N}_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_j} W_i N_i(M_j)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_j} W_i}, \quad (1)$$

where N_i is the number of satellites around primary galaxy i , W_i is the weight for the primary galaxy i and N_j is the number of primaries contributing to the j th bin of the LF. The weight W_i for each primary galaxy is determined by the aforementioned way.

The top panel of Figure 3 shows the resulting satellite LFs with the aforementioned weighting from the redshift distribution of primary galaxies not in filaments for the magnitude bins $^{0.0}M_c^r = -22.0$ and -23.0 . These weighted satellites LFs still significantly differ from those for the primary galaxies that are in the same magnitude bin but not in the filaments. This suggests that the redshift bias cannot account for the difference between the satellite LFs of primary galaxies in filaments and those that are not in filaments. Moreover, a similarly weighted satellite LFs can be estimated in the same way but with weightings determined by such that the distribution of $^{0.0}(g-r)$ colours (rather than the distribution of the redshift) between filament and non-filament primaries match. Again, such a LF suggests that a potential colour bias also fails to account for the difference in satellite LF (see the bottom panel of Figure 3). Another source of possible systematic bias is the different environmental densities around primary galaxies in filaments and not in filaments. We checked this and statistically the primary galaxies in filaments and not in filaments have the same distribution of environmental densities. To summarise: *the difference in filament and non-filament satellite LF cannot be attributed to an underlying colour, redshift or environmental density bias. The filament and non-filament satellite LFs are intrinsically different.*

The difference in the bright end of the satellite LFs for these two subsamples of primary galaxies are most significant in the brightest two magnitude bins. We therefore show the radial distribution of satellites around primaries in filaments and not in filaments (for $^{0.0}M_c^r = -22.0, -23.0$) in Figure 4. In spite of the fact that the total number of satellites depends strongly on whether the primary is inside a filament or not, the mean radial distributions of satellites in these two environments are remarkably similar to each other, except that for the magnitude bin, $^{0.0}M_c^r = -22.0$, the radial distribution of satellites brighter -20 magnitude in r band seems slightly less centrally concentrated in filament primaries than for primary galaxies that are not in the filaments. This may be caused by the limited volume of the primary galaxies in filaments, since the result is relative noisy.




Fig. 3.— The comparison between directly estimated satellites LFs for the primaries not in filaments and those estimated for the same primaries with the weighting from the redshift distribution (top pannel) and colour distribution (bottom panel) are shown in squares and dashed line respectively. The directly estimated LFs for the primary galaxies in the same magnitude bins but in the filaments are shown in solid lines for reference. The codes of colours are the same as in previous figures.

4. Summary and Conclusions

Using a stacking analysis we have estimated the satellite LFs for isolated primary galaxies in filaments and those that are in the same magnitude bin but not in filaments. The isolated primary samples are selected as in Guo et al. (2012). Filaments are traced by the Bisous model as described in Tempel et al. (2014).

By analyzing the satellite LF for primary galaxies in filaments, we have found strong observational evidence that the filamentary environment affects the abundance of bright satellites. Host galaxies in filaments have more bright satellites than those not in filaments. Except for the faintest




Fig. 4.— The scaled projected density profiles of satellites brighter than -20 magnitude in r band for the primary galaxies in filaments and not in filaments. The codes of legends are the same as in previous plots.

magnitude bin (where the signal-to-noise is too low), the amplitude of the satellite LFs of the primary galaxies in filaments is higher than those of primaries that are not in filaments but in the same magnitude bin. At the bright end of the satellite LFs, the increase is approximately by a factor of $1.5 \sim 2$. Furthermore, we have shown that such difference is not caused by a redshift, colour or environmental bias in selecting filaments and galaxies. We have also shown that the mean radial distribution of satellites brighter than a r -band magnitude of -20 around the primary galaxies in the filaments and not in the filaments are more or less consistent with each other in spite of the obviously difference between the total numbers of satellites.

Previous numerical studies have shown that the abundance of dark matter subhaloes may depend on the environment: haloes in filaments may have more subhaloes than those in other cosmic web environments (Cautun et al. in preparation). The properties of subhaloes in filaments can be also different from those in the other environments and this may affect galaxy formation since the satellite LF is a result of the gas physics that regulate star formation in small haloes. Our results thus suggest that galaxy formation itself may be more efficient in subhaloes that are born in and accreted through filaments. The filamentary environment

may be a crucial component of galaxy formation on such small scales.

ET acknowledge the ESF grants MJD272 and the European Regional Development Fund. NIL acknowledges a grant from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*.

REFERENCES

- Aihara, H., Allende Prieto, C., An, D., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 193, 29
- Alpaslan, M., Robotham, A. S. G., Driver, S., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 438, 177
- Altay, G., Colberg, J. M., & Croft, R. A. C. 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 1422
- Aragon-Calvo, M. A. 2013, *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1303.1590
- Aragón-Calvo, M. A., van de Weygaert, R., Jones, B. J. T., & van der Hulst, J. M. 2007, *ApJ*, 655, L5
- Blanton, M. R., Eisenstein, D., Hogg, D. W., Schlegel, D. J., & Brinkmann, J. 2005, *ApJ*, 629, 143
- Blanton, M. R., & Roweis, S. 2007, *AJ*, 133, 734
- Bond, J. R., Kofman, L., & Pogosyan, D. 1996, *Nature*, 380, 603
- Cautun, M., van de Weygaert, R., & Jones, B. J. T. 2013, *MNRAS*, 429, 1286
- Colless, M., Dalton, G., Maddox, S., et al. 2001, *MNRAS*, 328, 1039
- Colless, M., Peterson, B. A., Jackson, C., et al. 2003, *ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints*, astro-ph/0306581
- Dressler, A. 1980, *ApJ*, 236, 351
- Dubois, Y., Pichon, C., Welker, C., et al. 2014, *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1402.1165
- Einasto, M., Lietzen, H., Tempel, E., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 562, A87
- Guo, Q., Cole, S., Eke, V., & Frenk, C. 2011, *MNRAS*, 417, 370

- . 2012, MNRAS, 427, 428
- Guo, Q., Cole, S., Eke, V., Frenk, C., & Helly, J. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 1838
- Hahn, O., Carollo, C. M., Porciani, C., & Dekel, A. 2007a, MNRAS, 381, 41
- Hahn, O., Porciani, C., Carollo, C. M., & Dekel, A. 2007b, MNRAS, 375, 489
- Huchra, J., Jarrett, T., Skrutskie, M., et al. 2005, in Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series, Vol. 329, Nearby Large-Scale Structures and the Zone of Avoidance, ed. A. P. Fairall & P. A. Woudt, 135
- Jones, B. J. T., van de Weygaert, R., & Aragón-Calvo, M. A. 2010, MNRAS, 408, 897
- Kauffmann, G., White, S. D. M., Heckman, T. M., et al. 2004, MNRAS, 353, 713
- Libeskind, N. I., Hoffman, Y., Forero-Romero, J., et al. 2013a, MNRAS, 428, 2489
- Libeskind, N. I., Hoffman, Y., Knebe, A., et al. 2012, MNRAS, 421, L137
- Libeskind, N. I., Hoffman, Y., Steinmetz, M., et al. 2013b, ApJ, 766, L15
- Lietzen, H., Tempel, E., Heinämäki, P., et al. 2012, A&A, 545, A104
- Murphy, D. N. A., Eke, V. R., & Frenk, C. S. 2011, MNRAS, 413, 2288
- Tal, T., & van Dokkum, P. G. 2011, ApJ, 731, 89
- Tegmark, M., Blanton, M. R., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2004, ApJ, 606, 702
- Tempel, E., & Libeskind, N. I. 2013, ApJ, 775, L42
- Tempel, E., Saar, E., Liivamägi, L. J., et al. 2011, A&A, 529, A53
- Tempel, E., Stoica, R. S., Martínez, V. J., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 438, 3465
- Tempel, E., Stoica, R. S., & Saar, E. 2013, MNRAS, 428, 1827
- Wang, W., & White, S. D. M. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 2574
- York, D. G., Adelman, J., Anderson, Jr., J. E., et al. 2000, AJ, 120, 1579
- Zhang, Y., Yang, X., Faltenbacher, A., et al. 2009, ApJ, 706, 747
- Zhang, Y., Yang, X., Wang, H., et al. 2013, ApJ, 779, 160